

Objections to the Specification:

The Examiner objected to the entire specification. The Examiner stated: "The specification is nearly incomprehensible when viewed for subject matter pertaining to the claimed invention. For example, pages 1-5 and 9-16 give a tutorial on object-oriented programming (OOP); pages 16-64 provide guidance interspersed with programming examples toward the design of object-oriented software architectures; and pages 65-137 consist almost solely of Visual Basic program code. The specification to this point (137 pages) appears to be an outline and source code description of how to build what is presumably the basis for the invention, although the connection between the two is not at all clear."

Applicants respectfully disagree with the objections of the Examiner. The entire specification includes many different aspects of the invention, which are important for understanding the invention and the best mode contemplated by the inventors to carry out the invention. The entire specification should be kept intact. In 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is stated: "The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor or carrying out the invention." The Examiner did not cite any statutory authority requiring Applicants to delete information. Therefore, in view of the fact that the scope of the allowed subject matter is not yet ascertainable the Applicants should not now be required to delete any information from this application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Nonetheless, upon indication of allowable subject matter, Applications are willing to reevaluate the Examiner's objection in view of the scope of the allowed claims.

35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Moreover, the Examiner said "The limitation 'wherein the characteristics . . .' lacks sufficient antecedent basis for 'the characteristics'".